

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 15, 16, and 43 have been examined. Claims 6-14 and 17-43 are withdrawn from consideration, and have accordingly been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 15, and 16 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Formal matters***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings as filed on April 4, 2006.

***Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,765 to Eichenlaub (the '765 patent).

Claim 1 recites the feature of an optical unit which refracts the light emitted from said pixels and emits the light in directions different from each other. The Examiner maintains that this feature is met by the '765 patent by virtue of sheet 118 (shown in Fig. 5) and the description at col. 6, lines 46-53. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

At col. 6, lines 46-53, Eichenlaub describes that sheet 118 has lenses such that when the lens sheet 118 is in a close position, the display projects three dimensional, autostereoscopic images into a region of space in front of the display, and when the lens sheet 118 is flipped up, full resolution two dimensional images are displayed for viewing. Thus, lens sheet 118 eliminates an image separation effect. In other words, when closed, lens sheet 118 *combines* two images into a 3D image projected into a region of space in front of the display. By contrast, claim 1 sets forth that the optical unit "refracts the light and emits the light in *directions different*

from each other” (emphasis added). This feature is thus not disclosed by the ‘765 patent, and claim 1 is therefore patentable over the ‘765 patent for this reason.

Moreover, amended claim 1 recites the feature of a fixing layer which fixes the optical unit to the display unit. Applicant respectfully submits that the ‘765 patent does not disclose this feature.

Lastly, claim 1 recites the feature wherein a gap is formed between the display panel and the optical unit in the image display area. Applicant respectfully submits that the ‘765 patent does not disclose this feature.

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the ‘765 patent for these reasons.

Claim 3 is patentable based on its dependency.

***Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 2, 15, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the ‘765 patent. Claims 4-5 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the ‘765 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,345 to Eichenlaub (the ‘345 patent).

Claims 2, 4, 5, 15, and 16 each depend from claim 1 which has been shown to be patentable over the ‘765 patent. The ‘345 patent does not cure the deficiencies of the ‘765 patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 5, 15, and 16 are patentable over the ‘765 patent and the ‘345 patent, either alone or in combination.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 13, 2006